



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/448,154	11/24/1999	PAUL S. GERMSCHIED	33012/274/10	4721

7590 08/02/2002

CHARLES A JOHNSON
UNISYS CORPORATION
LAW DEPARTMENT M S 4773
2470 HIGHCREST ROAD
ROSEVILLE, MN 55113

EXAMINER

WASSUM, LUKE S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2177

DATE MAILED: 08/02/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/448,154

Applicant(s)

GERMSCHIED ET AL.

Examiner

Luke S. Wassum

Art Unit

2177

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 April 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 April 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Receipt of Applicant's Amendment, filed 25 April 2002, is acknowledged.
2. As a result of the amendment, claim 16 has been amended. Claims 1-20 are now presented for examination.

Drawings

3. Receipt of new formal drawings, filed 25 April 2002, is acknowledged. These drawings are approved by the examiner.

Specification

4. As a result of the amendment to the Specification, all pending objections to the Specification are withdrawn by the examiner.

Claim Objections

5. As a result of the amendment to claim 16, the objection to claim 16 is withdrawn by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 2177

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

7. Claims 1-4, 6-8, 11-14 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Garrison** (U.S. Patent 6,275,939).

8. Regarding claim 1, **Garrison** teaches an improvement in a data processing environment having a user terminal at a site for generating a service request responsively coupled via a publicly accessible digital data communication network to a database management system having at least one database as claimed, comprising security profile corresponding to a site whereby said database management system permits said user terminal to access said at least one database (see col. 4, lines 1-32; see also col. 6, line 60 through col. 7, line 32; see also col. 7, line 50 through col. 8, line 37).

9. Regarding claim 6, **Garrison** teaches an apparatus as claimed, comprising:

a) a user terminal located at a site (see col. 4, lines 1-32);

- b) a database management system having access to a database responsively coupled to said user terminal via a publicly accessible digital data communication network (see col. 4, lines 1-32); and
 - c) a security profile generated by said database management system corresponding to said site whereby said database management system provides access to a particular portion of said database corresponding to said security profile (see col. 7, line 50 through col. 8, line 37).
10. Regarding claim 11, **Garrison** teaches a method of utilizing a user terminal located at a site to access a remote database management system having a database via a publicly accessible digital data communication network as claimed, comprising:
- a) transmitting a service request requiring access to said database from said user terminal (see col. 6, line 60 through col. 7, line 32; see also col. 7, line 50 through col. 8, line 37);
 - b) receiving said service request by said remote database management system (see col. 6, line 60 through col. 7, line 32; see also col. 7, line 50 through col. 8, line 37);
 - c) determining a security profile corresponding to said site (see col. 6, line 60 through col. 7, line 32; see also col. 7, line 50 through col. 8, line 37);
 - d) comparing said security profile with said service request (see col. 6, line 60 through col. 7, line 32; see also col. 7, line 50 through col. 8, line 37); and
 - e) honoring said service request if and only if said service request corresponds to said security profile (see col. 6, line 60 through col. 7, line 32; see also col. 7, line 50 through col. 8, line 37).

11. Regarding claim 16, **Garrison** teaches an apparatus as claimed, comprising:
 - a) means located at a site for permitting a user to interact with a database responsively coupled via a publicly accessible digital data communication network (see col. 4, lines 1-32);
 - b) means responsively coupled to said permitting means via said publicly accessible digital data communication network for offering data processing services involving access to said database in response to said service request (see col. 6, line 60 through col. 7, line 32; see also col. 7, line 50 through col. 8, line 37); and
 - c) means responsively coupled to said offering means for preventing said offering means from offering said data processing services to said user in response to said service request unless said site corresponds to a security profile wherein said security profile permits access to said database (see col. 6, line 60 through col. 7, line 32; see also col. 7, line 50 through col. 8, line 37).
12. Regarding claim 2, **Garrison** additionally teaches an improvement wherein said security profile is generated by said data management system (see col. 6, line 60 through col. 7, line 32; see also col. 7, line 50 through col. 8, line 37).
13. Regarding claims 3, 8, 12, 13 and 18, **Garrison** additionally teaches an improvement, method and apparatus further comprising a special field responsively coupled to a service request whereby said database management system receives said special field and generates said security profile corresponding to said site and to said special field (see discussion of predefined password at col. 6,

Art Unit: 2177

lines 60-65; see also col. 6, line 60 through col. 7, line 32; see also col. 7, line 50 through col. 8, line 37).

14. Regarding claims 4, 14 and 17, **Garrison** additionally teaches an improvement, method and apparatus wherein said publicly accessible digital data communication network further comprises the Internet (see col. 4, lines 1-32).

15. Regarding claim 7, **Garrison** additionally teaches an apparatus wherein said user terminal accesses said data entity by transferring a service request to said system (see col. 6, line 60 through col. 7, line 32; see also col. 7, line 50 through col. 8, line 37).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

16. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

17. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made

Art Unit: 2177

in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

18. Claims 5, 9, 10, 15, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Garrison** (U.S. Patent 6,275,939) in view of **King** ("Hazards Control Department Use of the Sperry Database Management System MAPPER").

19. Regarding claims 5, 9, 15 and 19, **Garrison** teaches an improvement to a data processing environment, method and apparatus substantially as claimed.

Garrison does not teach the improvement, method and apparatus wherein said database management system is MAPPER.

However, **King** teaches a system wherein the database management system used is MAPPER (see first paragraph).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use MAPPER as the database management system, since MAPPER is extremely versatile and is considered one of the best fourth generation programs, and furthermore since it contains, in addition to a database management system, a word processor, office automation program including electronic mail, and color graphics routines (see first paragraph).

Art Unit: 2177

20. Regarding claim 10, **Garrison** additionally teaches an apparatus wherein said publicly accessible digital data communication network further comprises the World Wide Web (see col. 4, lines 1-32).

21. Regarding claim 20, **Garrison** additionally teaches an apparatus wherein said permitting means further comprises an industry standard personal computer (see col. 4, lines 1-60).

22. Claims 5, 9, 10, 15, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Garrison** (U.S. Patent 6,275,939) in view of **Unisys** ("Why Do I Need Cool ICE?").

23. Regarding claims 5, 9, 15 and 19, **Garrison** teaches an improvement to a data processing environment, method and apparatus substantially as claimed.

Garrison does not teach the improvement, method and apparatus wherein said database management system is MAPPER.

However, **Unisys** teaches a system wherein the database management system used is MAPPER (see page 3, second paragraph).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use MAPPER as the database management system, since MAPPER has been tuned for reliability, scalability, and high performance, and furthermore, since the technology has been used for years by thousands of users for many different kinds of applications, and since it has gained a reputation for

Art Unit: 2177

performing well for everything from small data analysis applications to huge transaction systems, and since its reliability is exemplary (see page 3, second paragraph).

24. Regarding claim 10, **Garrison** additionally teaches an apparatus wherein said publicly accessible digital data communication network further comprises the World Wide Web (see col. 4, lines 1-32).

25. Regarding claim 20, **Garrison** additionally teaches an apparatus wherein said permitting means further comprises an industry standard personal computer (see col. 4, lines 1-60).

26. Claims 5, 9, 10, 15, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Garrison** (U.S. Patent 6,275,939) in view of **Gebauer** (U.S. Patent 6,324,539).

27. Regarding claims 5, 9, 15 and 19, **Garrison** teaches an improvement to a data processing environment, method and apparatus substantially as claimed.

Garrison does not teach the improvement, method and apparatus wherein said database management system is MAPPER.

However, **Gebauer** teaches a system wherein the database management system used is MAPPER (see col. 1, lines 56-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use MAPPER as the database management system, since MAPPER is one of the most successful database management systems available (see col. 1, lines 56-65), and furthermore that providing access to a proprietary database management system such as MAPPER through the Internet would yield an extremely inexpensive and universally available means for accessing the data which it contains and such access would be without the need for considerable specialized training (see col. 2, lines 45-51).

28. Regarding claim 10, **Garrison** additionally teaches an apparatus wherein said publicly accessible digital data communication network further comprises the World Wide Web (see col. 4, lines 1-32).

29. Regarding claim 20, **Garrison** additionally teaches an apparatus wherein said permitting means further comprises an industry standard personal computer (see col. 4, lines 1-60).

Response to Arguments

30. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

31. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Garrison (U.S. Patent 6,385,730) teaches a secure client/server system that provides remote access to a database system without allowing unauthorized users to access data stored within the database system.

Funk (U.S. Patent 5,721,779) teaches an apparatus for verifying the identity of a party.

ECC [1] ("Cool ICE Security Features") teaches the security features of the Cool ICE system.

ECC [2] ("The MAPPER System") teaches features of the MAPPER System.

Unisys ("Secure Electronic Business: How Cool ICE Makes It Happen") teaches Cool ICE security features that support electronic business.

Green ("2nd Half of CBAS Conversion Starts") teaches the conversion of the Command Budget Automated System to the Unisys Corporation MAPPER database management system.

Knight ("Unisys Phasing Out Its Proprietary OS") teaches the move by Unisys Corporation to standardize its mainframe and minicomputer systems on UNIX, phasing out the firm's proprietary operating system.


Seybold ("Sperry's Mapper: System Generator for End-Users") teaches the features of the Sperry Corporation MAPPER database management system.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Luke S. Wassum whose telephone number is 703-305-5706. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30-5:30, alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene can be reached on 703-305-9790. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.


In addition, INFORMAL or DRAFT communications may be faxed directly to the examiner at 703-746-5658.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.



Luke S. Wassum
Art Unit 2177

lsw
July 30, 2002



JEAN R. HOMERE
PRIMARY EXAMINER